



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/380,256	08/25/1999	SADEG MUSTAFA FARIS	REVEO-9999	2384

7590

08/13/2002

Gerow D. Brill
Reveo, Inc.
Legal Department
85 Executive Blvd.
Elmsford, NY 10523

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HOAN C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/380,256

Applicant(s)

FARIS ET AL.

Examiner

HOAN C. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,9,10,13,17,28-31,47,50,65,68,69,79 and 102-115 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2, 4-8, 10-11, 14-16, 18-27, 32-46, 48-49, 51-64, 70-78, 80-101 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3,9,10,13,17,28-31,47,50,65,68,69,79 and 102-115 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments with respect to Amended claims 1, 3, 13, 47, 50, 68 and New Claims 102-112 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection with the old references which apply in office action mailing date March 4, 2002. Therefore, this is a Final action.

Double Patenting

1. Claims 1, 3, 102, and 103 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of copending Application No. 08/805603 (patent No. US5940150A).

Claims 1, 9-10 and 104-105 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4 and 8-9 of copending Application No. 08/805603 (patent No. US5940150A).

Claims 1 and 13 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 and 13 of copending Application No. 08/805603 (patent No. US5940150A).

Claims 1, 17 and 28 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 and 14 of copending Application No. 08/805603 (patent No. US5940150A).

Claims 1 and 30 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 and 25 of copending Application No. 08/805603 (patent No. US5940150A).

Claims 1 and 31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 and 24 of copending Application No. 08/805603 (patent No. US5940150A).

Claims 1 and 79 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 and 21 of copending Application No. 08/805603 (patent No. US5940150A). The claim 79 of the present application is broader than claim 21 of copending Application No. 08/805603, thus claim 21 of copending Application No. 08/805603 should provide all limitations in claim 79 of the present application.

Claims 102 and 104-105 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4 and 25 of copending Application No. 08/805603 (patent No. US5940150A).

Claim 102 and 110 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4 and 14 of copending Application No. 08/805603 (patent No. US5940150A).

Claims 102 and 111 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4 and 24 of copending Application No. 08/805603 (patent No. US5940150A).

Claim 112 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 21 of copending Application No. 08/805603 (patent No. US5940150A).

All similar dependent claims depend on a broader base claim 1 in the present application comparing to claim 1 in Application No. 08/805603.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claim 1 in the present application is broader than claim 1 of Application No. 08/805603, in which an electro-optical glazing panel is made of non-linear distribution of CLC (narrower limitation). [In another words, the claim 1 of Application No. 08/805603 provides all limitation of claim 1 in the present application]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify electro-optical glazing structure as Application No. 08/805603 disclosed without an electro-optical glazing panel made of a non-linear distribution of CLC for reducing manufacture cost with a conventional electro-optical glazing structure.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

1. Claims 29 and 109 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4 and 25 of copending Application No. 08/805603 (patent No. US5940150A) in view of Lynam (US5239406A).

Lynam (Fig. 9, col. 20, lines 54-57) discloses the electro-electric glazing structure, wherein an ultraviolet reflecting layer 67 for protecting the electro-electric glazing structure from degradation due to ultraviolet radiation (col. 1, lines 35-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the electro-electric glazing structure with an ultraviolet reflecting layer for protecting the electro-electric glazing structure from degradation due to ultraviolet radiation

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

1. Claims 68 and 84 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4 of copending Application No. 08/805603 (patent No. US5940150A) in view of Sakata (US4729640). Sakata (Figs. 24A-C, col. 1, lines 37-42) discloses a light modulation or an electro-optical glazing structure (same device with different use) comprising:

(a) an electro-optical glazing panel of laminated construction having first and second optical states of operations;

(b) optical state switching means to change voltage for switching electro-optical glazing panel to first optical state of operation in order to induce electro-optical glazing structure into reflection mode of operation and for switching electro-optical glazing panel to second optical state of operation in order induce electro-optical glazing structure into transmission mode of operation;

wherein electromagnetic radiation within a first pre-specified bandwidth falling incident upon the electro-optical panel is totally reflection from the electro-optical panel without absorption (Fig. 24A, col. 23, lines 10-15);

wherein electromagnetic radiation within a second pre-specified bandwidth (that must different from first bandwidth for total reflection) falling incident upon the electro-optical panel is totally transmission from the electro-optical panel without absorption (Fig. 24C, lines 27-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the electro-electric glazing structure; wherein electromagnetic radiation within a first pre-specified bandwidth falling incident upon the electro-optical panel is totally reflection from the electro-optical panel without absorption; wherein electromagnetic radiation within a second pre-specified bandwidth (that must different from first bandwidth for total reflection) falling incident upon the electro-optical panel is totally transmission from the electro-optical panel without absorption for manipulating EM radiation through the electro-electric glazing structure.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the features "scattering layer for controllably scattering light" in claims 47 and 113 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 113 and 114 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims 47 and 113 (50 and 114) are double claims, which contain the same subject matters. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 102 and 106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. (US5686979) in view of Sharp et al. (US5528393A).

In regard to claims 1 and 102, Weber et al. (Figs. 1-7b) disclose an electro-optical glazing structure comprising

(a) an electro-optical glazing panel of laminated construction having first and second optical states of operations; wherein the electro-optic glazing structure separately controls the transmission and reflection of visible light;

(b) optical state switching means for switching electro-optical glazing panel to first optical state of operation in order to induce electro-optical glazing structure into reflection mode of operation and for switching electro-optical glazing panel to second optical state of operation in order induce electro-optical glazing structure into transmission mode of operation as Figs. 3 and 4 shown.

However, Weber et al. fail to disclose an electro-optical glazing panel comprising

- first electrically-passive liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panel/second electrically-passive liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panel/an electrically-active π -phase retardation panel interposed between the first and second electrically-active liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panels (claim 1).
- first electrically-active liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panel/second electrically-active liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panel/an electrically-passive π -phase retardation panel interposed between the first and second electrically-active liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panels (claim 102).

In regard to claims 102 and 106, Sharp et al. (Figs. 2b-2d, col. 7, line 9 to col. 8 line 6) disclose the electro-electric glazing structure or split-element liquid crystal tunable optical filter (again both having same structure with different use) comprising:

Art Unit: 2871

- first electrically-active/tunable liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panel 40 or 50;
- second electrically-active/tunable liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panel 45 or 55;
- an electrically-passive π -phase retardation panel 30 interposed between the first and second electrically-active liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panels

wherein the liquid crystal is cholesteric liquid crystal CLC (col. 15, lines 43-45).

In regard to claims 1 and 3, Sharp et al. (Fig. 5c) disclose the electro-electric glazing structure or split-element liquid crystal tunable optical filter comprising:

- first electrically-passive CLC liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panel, which has a circularly polarization;
- second electrically-passive CLC liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panel, which has a circularly polarization;
- an electrically-active π -phase retardation panel 30 interposed between the first and second electrically-active liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panels.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the electro-electric glazing structure as Weber et al. disclosed with comprising the feature disclosed by Sharp et al. for providing wide-field, band-pass, cut-on/off and notch transmission functions.

1. Claims 47, 50, and 113-114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. (US5686979) in view of Nilsson (US3833288).

Weber et al. (Figs. 1-7b) disclose an electro-optical glazing structure comprising
(a) an electro-optical glazing panel of laminated construction having first and second optical states of operations; wherein the electro-optic glazing structure separately controls the transmission and reflection of visible light;

(b) optical state switching means for switching electro-optical glazing panel to first optical state of operation in order to induce electro-optical glazing structure into reflection mode of operation and for switching electro-optical glazing panel to second optical state of operation in order induce electro-optical glazing structure into transmission mode of operation as Figs. 3 and 4 shown.

Weber et al. teach (Fig. 2) an electro-optical glazing structure further comprising a sheet having large plurality of pairs 44 of layers 41 and 43 parallel to a surface of the sheet, each pair of layer having a difference between the materials A and B in each layer of pair, the difference being in the index of refraction for electromagnetic radiation having the first linear polarization, wherein there is little difference (col. 6, lines 58-55) in the index of refraction for electromagnetic radiation having the second linear polarization(thus, the polarized light is parallel to transmission axis 40 or 42), the total thickness of each pair of layers in the large plurality of layers varying non linearly/randomly across the sheet, thus sheet will transmit the polarization component of randomly polarized light (col. 6, lines 35-39). An electro-optical glazing panel transmits and reflects electromagnetic radiation of a first bandwidth (400-1200nm) of an

Art Unit: 2871

EM radiation. However, the sheet having large plurality of pairs reflects in second bandwidth, which covers any of the first bandwidth.

Weber et al. also teach (Fig. 9) an electro-optical glazing structure 136 comprising further means of diffuser/scattering layer 134, a front absorptive polar 138, a rear absorptive polar 140 and a liquid crystal panel 142 for further controlling electromagnetic radiation incident on the an electro-optical glazing panel 136.

However, Weber et al. fail to disclose an electro-optical glazing structure a controllable scattering layer

Nilsson teaches (in abstract) producing a controllable scattering layer for preventing any appreciable image distortion.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the electro-electric glazing structure as Weber et al. disclosed with comprising a controllable scattering layer for preventing any appreciable image distortion.

1. Claims 9, 13, 65, 79, and 104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. (US5686979) in view of Sharp et al. (US5528393A) as applied to claims 1 and 47, and in further view of Baughman et al. (US5152111).

In regard to claims 9 and 104, Baughman et al. (Figs. 1-6) teach the electro-electric glazing structure further comprising a window frame 5 for mounting the electro-electric glazing panel within house or office building (col. 1, lines 25-29).

Art Unit: 2871

In regard to claims 13 and 79, Baughman et al. (Figs. 4-6, col. 9, 28-58) teach the composite electro-electric glazing structure comprising a plurality of the electro-electric glazing structure (7/14/11 and 7'/14'/11'), wherein the composite electro-electric glazing structure has more than two optical states of operation which permit complex levels of electromagnetic radiation control. Besides, words "complex levels" is relative term (see 112 rejection above).

In regard to claim 65, Weber et al. (col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 6) teach an electro-optical glazing structure comprising a layer of mixture of a polymer and a liquid crystal material for effective in dynamic scattering at room temperature.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the electro-electric glazing structure as Weber et al. disclosed with (a) a window frame 5 for mounting the electro-electric glazing panel within house or office building; (b) a plurality of the electro-electric glazing structure for manipulating the electromagnetic radiation control; (c) a means with preventing heat or IR for further controlling electromagnetic radiation incident on the electro-optical panel; (d) a layer of mixture of a polymer and a liquid crystal material for effective in dynamic scattering at room temperature.

3. Claims 17, 28, 30, 31, 107-108 and 110-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. (US5686979) in view of Sharp et al. (US5528393A) as applied to claims 1 and 102, and in further view of Meyer et al. (US5336965A).

Art Unit: 2871

Meyers et al. (Fig. 2-4, col. 4, lines 46-49) teach the electro-electric glazing structure wherein the transmission of the visible portion of the electromagnetic spectrum is controlled and the infrared (IR) portion of the electromagnetic spectrum is reflected. Fig. 2 shows there is an IR reflecting layer 16.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the electro-electric glazing structure as Weber et al. disclosed with an IR reflecting layer 16 for preventing heat or IR transfer cross the electro-electric glazing structure (IR is presented for heat energy in the electromagnetic spectrum).

4. Claims 29 and 109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. (US5686979) in view of Sharp et al. (US5528393A) as applied to claims 1 and 102, and in view of Lynam (US5239406A).

Lynam (Fig. 9, col. 20, lines 54-57) discloses the electro-electric glazing structure, wherein an ultraviolet reflecting layer 67 for protecting the electro-electric glazing structure from degradation due to ultraviolet radiation (col. 1, lines 35-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the electro-electric glazing structure as Weber et al. disclosed with an ultraviolet reflecting layer for protecting the electro-electric glazing structure from degradation due to ultraviolet radiation

5. Claims 68 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakata (US4729640) in view of Sharp et al. (US5528393A).

Sakata (Figs. 24A-C, col. 1, lines 37-42) discloses a light modulation or an electro-optical glazing structure (same device with different use) comprising:

(a) an electro-optical glazing panel of laminated construction having first and second optical states of operations;

(b) optical state switching means to change voltage for switching electro-optical glazing panel to first optical state of operation in order to induce electro-optical glazing structure into reflection mode of operation and for switching electro-optical glazing panel to second optical state of operation in order induce electro-optical glazing structure into transmission mode of operation;

wherein electromagnetic radiation within a first pre-specified bandwidth falling incident upon the electro-optical panel is totally reflection from the electro-optical panel without absorption (Fig. 24A, col. 23, lines 10-15);

wherein electromagnetic radiation within a second pre-specified bandwidth (that must different from first bandwidth for total reflection) falling incident upon the electro-optical panel is totally transmission from the electro-optical panel without absorption (Fig. 24C, lines 27-32).

However, Sakata fails to disclose an electro-optical glazing panel comprising first electrically-active liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panel/second electrically-active liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panel/an electrically-

passive π -phase retardation panel interposed between the first and second electrically-active liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panels (claim 102).

Sharp et al. (Figs. 2b-2d, col. 7, line 9 to col. 8 line 6) disclose the electro-electric glazing structure or split-element liquid crystal tunable optical filter (again both having same structure with different use) comprising:

- first electrically-active/tunable liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panel 40 or 50;
- second electrically-active/tunable liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panel 45 or 55;
- an electrically-passive π -phase retardation panel 30 interposed between the first and second electrically-active liquid crystal electromagnetic radiation polarizing panels

wherein the liquid crystal is cholesteric liquid crystal CLC (col. 15, lines 43-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the electro-electric glazing structure as Sakata disclosed with comprising the feature disclosed by Sharp et al. for providing wide-field, band-pass, cut-on/off and notch transmission functions.

2. Claims 10 and 105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. (US5686979) in view of Sharp et al. (US5528393A) as applied to

claims 1 and 47, and in further view of Baughman et al. (US5152111) as applied to claims 9 and 104, and in further view of Walsh et al. (US5734919).

Walsh et al. teach the notebook palm-top computer or electro-electric glazing structure further comprising:

- a electromagnetic sensor (heating sensor 140, col. 11 lines 1-3) on the window frame for sensing heating/electromagnetic conditions;
- a battery supply (col. 2 lines 7-14) mounted within the window (or notebook) frame;
- a electromagnetic-powered battery recharger (Fig. 3 lines 49-57) mounted within the window frame;
- electrical circuitry mounted within window frame for producing control voltages for switching optical states of operation;
- programmable micro-computer chip (col. 13 lines 6-13 and Fig. 9 col. 65 lines 55-57) mounted within window frame for controlling the operation of battery recharger and electrical circuitry with low consumption.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the electro-electric glazing structure as Weber et al. disclosed with electromagnetic sensor for sensing heating/electromagnetic conditions, battery supply for providing power, a electromagnetic-powered battery recharger for providing long-life power and programmable micro-computer chip for controlling the operation of battery recharger and electrical circuitry with low consumption.

2. Claim 115 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. (US5686979) in view of Nilsson (US3833288) as applied to claim 113 above, and in further view of Baughman et al. (US5152111A).

Baughman et al. teach (col. 5 line 66 to col. 6 line 6, col. 7 lines 12-19, col. 10 lines 6-9) the electro-electric glazing structure with a layer of mixture of polymer and a liquid crystal material or of liquid crystal materials (liquid crystal material considers as another polymer) for purposes of tinning or for decorative poses.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the electro-electric glazing structure as Weber et al. disclosed with a layer of mixture of polymer and a liquid crystal material for purposes of tinning.

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2871

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HOAN C. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 306-0472. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY:8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SIKES L WILLIAM can be reached on (703) 308-4842. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-8178 for regular communications and (703) 308-5841 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0530.

HOAN C. NGUYEN
Examiner
Art Unit 2871

chn
August 6, 2002


TOANTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER